

of coercing friends. This is the lesson of U.S. secondary sanctions imposed against Europe and Canada over their refusal to support broad U.S. sanctions against Cuba, Iran and Libya.

Tailor sanctions narrowly. A focused response helps avoid jeopardizing other interests and an entire bilateral relationship over one area of disagreement. Such a response also does less harm to innocent people and makes it easier to garner multinational support. Sanctions designed to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction are a prime example. Where there are transgressions, the U.S. should direct any sanction against the foreign firms involved. If the government is to blame, Washington should cut off technological cooperation or trade in the relevant technologies. Political sanctions should be used sparingly if at all. U.S. officials should resist the temptation to break diplomatic relations or cancel high-level meetings. Such interactions provide opportunities for U.S. officials to make their case. All of this argues for narrowing the scope of sanctions against India and Pakistan—and not canceling this fall's planned presidential visit.

Don't hold major bilateral relationships hostage to a single issue. This is especially the case with a country like China, with which the U.S. has to balance interests that include maintaining stability on the Korean Peninsula, discouraging any support for weapons of mass destruction or missile programs of rogue states, managing the Taiwan-China situation, and promoting trade, market reform and human rights. A nearly identical argument could be made about applying broad sanctions against Russia because of its transgressions in the realm of missile exports.

Include humanitarian exceptions in any comprehensive sanctions. Innocents should not be made to suffer any more than is absolutely necessary. Including an exception that allows a target nation to import food and medicine should also make it easier to win domestic and international support. A humanitarian exception was made for Iraq—and one should be made for Cuba.

Issue a policy statement to Congress before or soon after a sanction is put in place. Such statements should be clear as to the purpose of the sanction; the required legal and political authority; the expected impact on the target, including its possible retaliation; the probable humanitarian consequences and steps to minimize them; the expected costs to the U.S.; the prospects for enforcing the sanction; and the anticipated degree of international support or opposition. In addition, policy makers should explain why a particular sanction, as opposed to other policy tools, was selected. Once sanctions are in place, policy makers should prepare a similar report to Congress every year. The proposed Sanctions Reform Act, sponsored by Sen. Richard Lugar (R., Ind.) and Reps. Lee Hamilton (D., Ind.) and Phil Crane (R., Ill.) takes many of these steps.

Include an exit strategy in every sanction plan. The criteria for lifting the sanction should be clearly spelled out. Current sanctions often lack this feature: The 1994 legislation that led to sanctions this year against India and Pakistan lacks any road map for how the sanctions might be reduced or lifted.

Allow the president discretion in the form of waivers. This would authorize the president to suspend or terminate a sanction if he judged it was in the interests of national security to do so. Such latitude is needed if international relationships are not to become hostage to one interest and if the executive is to have the flexibility needed to explore whether the introduction of limited incentives can bring about a desired policy

goal. Waivers have reduced some of the worst features of legislation that penalizes non-American firms doing business with Cuba, Iran and Libya. And the absence of waivers is likely to haunt U.S. policy toward India and Pakistan, making it more difficult to influence their future decisions involving the deployment or use of nuclear weapons.

Challenge the authority of states and municipalities to institute economic sanctions. The Constitution may not settle the struggle between the executive and legislative branches over the foreign-affairs power—but it clearly limits the struggle to the federal government. Yet states and municipalities are adopting selective purchasing laws that prohibit public agencies from buying goods and services from companies doing business in or with target countries. The Clinton administration should support efforts to stop states and cities from conducting foreign policy, such as a recently filed lawsuit to enjoin Massachusetts from enforcing its law that would effectively ban the state from doing business with companies active in Burma.

REFLEXIVE TENDENCY

All of these proposals have one purpose: to reduce Washington's reflexive tendency to impose sanctions whenever political leaders are not prepared to use military force or carry out more appropriate—but more controversial—policies. Economic sanctions are a serious instrument of foreign policy. They demand consideration as rigorous as that which precedes military intervention. The likely benefits of a particular sanction to U.S. foreign policy should be greater than the anticipated economic and political costs. Moreover, the relationship between how the sanction is likely to affect U.S. interests should compare favorably to the likely consequences of all other policies, including military intervention, covert action, diplomacy, offering incentives (used to manage North Korea's nuclear ambitions) or doing nothing.

U.S. politicians and policy makers often see sanctions as an expressive tool. In fact, they are a form of intervention that can cause great damage to innocent people, as well as to U.S. businesses, workers and foreign-policy interests. In addition, sanctions can reduce U.S. leverage. Elimination of education, training and aid for foreign militaries, mandated by Congress to express displeasure with Pakistan and Indonesia, reduces U.S. influence with a powerful constituency in both those countries.

Foreign policy is not therapy. Its purpose is not to feel good but to do good. America's leaders should keep this in mind whenever they consider the imposition of sanctions.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF GUAM JOINING UNITED STATES FAMILY AND INTRODUCTION OF H. RES. 494 REGARDING THE CENTENNIAL

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1998

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to say congratulations and Hafa Adai to our fellow citizens in Guam on marking the centennial of the American flag being raised on the island. In one hundred years Guam and its residents have provided a vital service to our national security and international relations within the Asian-Pacific region. In recognition of the centennial anniver-

sary, Delegate ROBERT UNDERWOOD has introduced H. Res. 494 to bring our attention to the relationship between Guam and the United States and to highlight the work that still remains to be done. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of Mr. UNDERWOOD's legislation.

When the Japanese military temporarily seized control of Guam during World War II, many Guamanians suffered greatly for their loyalty to the United States. Although its residents were not yet American citizens, many hid and protected Americans throughout the occupation and did so at their own peril. The patriotism and bravery shown was unflinching and should never be forgotten by the people of our nation.

Many of Guam's residents wish to change the current relationship with the Federal government. I firmly believe in the right of Guamanians to determine for themselves what is best for their future welfare. If the people of Guam believe that is best achieved through a change of status and becoming fully self-governing, then I will assist in that endeavor. In addition, we have had a hearing on Guam's Commonwealth legislation this Congress and we need to continue to work on that proposal.

Many activities continue to be held here in Washington and across Guam to mark the centennial anniversary. Some are light and joyous while others are more somber and reflective—but while the festivities continue in Hagatna and throughout Guam—let us be mindful of the past but with an eye towards the future.

Mr. Speaker, I call on you to schedule Congressman UNDERWOOD's legislation, H. Res. 494 for consideration by the House of Representatives before the August recess so the people of Guam know that this congress is respectful of the unique history we have with them and the commitment to their future.

INTRODUCING A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE TUSKEGEE AIRMEN NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

HON. BOB RILEY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1998

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, despite a widespread belief that they did not have the ability as black aviators to be effective war fighters, the famed Tuskegee Airmen of World War II proved that they were among the best pilots in the European Theater.

Affectionately known by the bomber crews they protected as the "Red Tails" (for the red paint on the tails of their fighters), the pilots of Tuskegee did not lose one bomber in their care to enemy fighters. As a result of their heroic service, the Tuskegee Airmen were one of America's most highly decorated fighter groups of World War II.

But the contributions of the Tuskegee Airmen did not end with the war. Because of their demonstrated ability as an effective fighting force and their individual heroism, the Tuskegee Airmen gave President Harry T. Truman the proof he needed to justify his decision in 1948 to desegregate the U.S. military. Finally, the Airmen's success served as an inspiration for the civil rights movement in following decades.